

**Response**

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/924,029

Filed: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012573-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING NETWORK ADDRESS INFORMATION IN A SERVER SYSTEM

---

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed February 10, 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “the admitted prior art”, and further in view of Verthein et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,678,284 (“Verthein”). Claims 8, 14, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “the admitted prior art,” and further in view of Verthein and Liu, U.S. Patent No. 6,185,110 (“Liu”).

With this Response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-20. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “the admitted prior art”, and further in view of Verthein et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,678,284 (“Verthein”). Regarding claim 1, the Examiner stated that:

As per claim 1, a server system with plurality of host processing cards and manual assignment of IP addresses to the host processing cards are admitted prior art (Applicant’s specification page 1). The admitted prior art does not have a management card with user interface for manual assignment of the IP addresses. In similar field of invention, Verthein teaches providing a general purpose computing card in the server chassis coupled to plurality of network service cards via the internal chassis bus. The general purpose computing card is installed with management software. This provides for improve network management and reduces access and processing time. (See Verthein col.2 lines 55-62, col. 3 lines 5-8). Hence, given the teaching of Verthein, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time of the invention to have a management card in the chassis of the prior art server system for managing the host processor cards in the chassis because it would have eliminated (sic) the need for connecting an external terminal to the chassis and improved management and reduced access time to the host processing cards in the chassis. (Office Action at pages 2-3).

Independent claim 1 recites “the management card configured to send received network address information to the plurality of host processor cards via the at least one bus, thereby configuring the host processor cards for management LAN communications.”

**Response**

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/924,029

Filed: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012573-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING NETWORK ADDRESS INFORMATION IN A SERVER SYSTEM

---

Applicant did not admit that this limitation is prior art. As the Examiner pointed out, Verthein discloses a general purpose computing card 24. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Verthein that the computing card 24 (or any other card disclosed therein) is configured to send received network address information to a plurality of host processor cards via a bus, thereby configuring the host processor cards for management LAN communications. Thus, the cited prior art, either alone, or in combination, does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1.

One of the requirements of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness is that “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” MPEP § 2143. Even if the computing card 24 disclosed in Verthein were incorporated into a server system with a plurality of host processor cards, which the Examiner appeared to propose despite no suggestion in the cited prior art to make such a combination, this combination does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest that the computing card 24 should be configured to send received network address information to the plurality of host processor cards via a bus, and thereby configure the host processor cards for management LAN communications. Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1 has not been established.

In view of the above, independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art, either alone, or in combination. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1, and reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Dependent claims 2-7 further limit patentably distinct claim 1, are further distinguishable over the cited prior art, and are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-7 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 9 recites “a controller configured to output entered network address information to the plurality of host processor cards via the at least one I<sup>2</sup>C bus connection, thereby configuring the plurality of host processor cards for network communications.” With respect to claim 9, the Examiner stated that “[a]s per claims 9-13, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 1-6 above.” (Office Action at page 4). For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, independent claim 9 is also not taught

**Response**

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/924,029

Filed: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012573-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING NETWORK ADDRESS INFORMATION IN A SERVER SYSTEM

---

or suggested by the cited prior art, either alone, or in combination. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 9, and reconsideration and allowance of claim 9 is respectfully requested. Dependent claims 10-13 further limit patentably distinct claim 9, are further distinguishable over the cited prior art, and are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-13 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 recites "sending entered network address information from the management card to the host processor cards, thereby configuring the host processor cards for management network communications." With respect to claim 15, the Examiner stated that "[a]s per claims 15-19, they are method corresponding the (sic) the system claims 1-6. Hence, they are rejected under similar rationale as claims 1-6 above." (Office Action at page 4). For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, independent claim 15 is also not taught or suggested by the cited prior art, either alone, or in combination. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 15, and reconsideration and allowance of claim 15 is respectfully requested. Dependent claims 16-19 further limit patentably distinct claim 15, are further distinguishable over the cited prior art, and are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 16-19 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 14, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over "the admitted prior art," and further in view of Verthein and Liu, U.S. Patent No. 6,185,110 ("Liu"). Dependent claims 8, 14, and 20 further limit patentably distinct claims 1, 9, and 15, respectively. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest the limitations of these independent claims addressed above. Claims 8, 14, and 20 are also further distinguishable over the cited prior art, and are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 8, 14, and 20 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-20 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

**Response**

Applicant: Thane M. Larson et al.

Serial No.: 09/924,029

Filed: August 7, 2001

Docket No.: 10012573-1

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING NETWORK ADDRESS INFORMATION IN A SERVER SYSTEM

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either David A. Plettner at Telephone No. (408) 447-3013, Facsimile No. (408) 447-0854 or Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Thane M. Larson et al.

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 5/10/05  
JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen  
Jeff A. Holmen  
Reg. No. 38,492

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:**

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 10<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2005.

By Jeff A. Holmen  
Name: Jeff A. Holmen